

REMARKS

Claims 2 to 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Sarraf in view of Buus.

Claims 2, 6, 8, 10 and 11 have been amended. Claim 12 has been added.

Reconsideration of the application in view of the following is respectfully requested.

Interview Summary

A telephonic interview was conducted on August 26, 2003 between applicant's representative William Gehris and Examiner Nghiem. Applicant's representative thanks the Examiner for his agreeing to the interview. Claim 2 was discussed, as was applicant's disclosure and the Sarraf reference. Applicant's representative stated the difference of Sarraf, in which a laser power varies due to the positioning and focus of the laser due to cavity feedback. The present application at [0028] was discussed, in which it is clear that the laser power of the present invention is controlled by varying the input power to the laser, since in the present application laser power may be varied without moving the laser. Applicant's representative discussed how this is inherent from the specification and the Examiner indicated that it would be acceptable to submit changes to this effect to the specification and claims via an RCE. No agreement as to allowability of the amended claims was reached

35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2 to 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Sarraf in view of Buus.

Claims 2, 6, 8, 10 and 11 now recite that the input laser power is varied. That the input laser power is varied is clear from the specification, for example in [0025] and [0033] which discusses varying the power independently of moving the laser or refocusing the laser. This is a

major advantage of the present invention over autofocus systems as in Sarraf (discussed at [0003] for example). As stated in [0033], the present invention permits for fewer moving parts.

Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection to claims 2 to 11 is respectfully requested.

New Claim 12

New claim 12 has been submitted which recites the step of “varying laser power or exposure time while maintaining the focus distance so as to vary a spot size of image spots on the printing surface.”

This new claim find support at [0025] for example, which clearly describes determining that the laser is 100 micrometers out of focus and then generating an image spot on the printing surface by increasing the laser power 10 percent while the laser remains a 100 micrometers out of focus.

Sarraf cannot vary the laser power while keeping the focus the same, as Sarraf must change the focus to alter the laser power.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and applicants respectfully request such action.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By:   
William Gehris  
Reg. No. 38,156

Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC  
485 Seventh Avenue  
New York, New York 10018  
(212) 736-1940